

## REMARKS

The present amendment and remarks are in response to the final office action entered in the above-identified application and mailed on February 2, 2009. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. All stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,449,715 to Krivoshein (hereafter Krivoshein) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,266,812 to Pagnano (hereafter Pagnano). Also, the specification was objected to for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for “Storage Module” found in Claim 19. With this response Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 19 to remove all of the cited grounds for rejecting the claims.

Turning first to the objection to the specification for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for the term “Storage Module”, Applicant has amended claim 19. Claim 19 now calls for a “Storage Device” which is supported in the specification by at least the storage device 68 or memory 64 shown in Fig. 2. With this change Applicant believes there should be no objection to the specification.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 19 to more clearly distinguish the claims over the art cited by the examiner. In general, the amendments clarify that a host system requests a device description identification from the actual process control device for which a device description is needed. The host system then receives the device description identification from the actual device for which the device description is needed. This differs from the process control configuration system disclosed by Krivoshein and the arrangements, storage mediums, and methods for transmitting a non-proprietary language device description of Pagnano.

Krivoshein teaches that a user may select or create a device revision for a Profibus device in a configuration hierarchy. (Col. 21, line 65-Col 22, line 9). An input interface provides a screen that presents a device revision dialog box. (Fig. 6). The user may provide a description of the device revision, and a user input routine may access the device’s GSD file to obtain the object type, the identification number, and the hardware and software release of the device revision. Thus, Krivoshein teaches obtaining a device description identification (or something similar) not from the device itself, but from a separate user input section of the process control configuration system. Furthermore, Krivoshein relies on the user to provide a

description of the device revision. Krivoshein does not disclose a host system requesting a device description identification from the process control device itself as now called for in the claims of the present application. Further, Krivoshein does not teach receiving the device description identification from the process control device, as called for in the amended claims, but rather from the separate input section of the process control configuration system.

Pagnano is cited as teaching the downloading of a device description associated with a received device description identification, and updating a host application to include the device description. As argued in Applicant's previous response, Applicant does not agree with the examiner's reading of Pagnano. Nonetheless, even if Pagnano were to disclose the features alleged by the examiner, the resulting combination of Krivoshein with the teaching of Pagnano would still not teach every element of any of the amended claims currently pending in the application. Specifically, Pagnano does not teach a host system requesting a device description identification from a process control device itself and receiving the device description identification from the process control device which, as described above, are also absent from the teaching of Krivoshein

Since the combined teaching of Krivoshein and Pagnano do not teach every element of the claimed invention, claims 1-20 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw the final rejection and allow the claims to issue.

If the examiner has any questions regarding the present response she is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney at the number provided below.

Dated: March 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Jeffrey H. Canfield/

Jeffrey H. Canfield

Registration No.: 38,404

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant